

Date: Sun, 21 Feb 93 04:30:21 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #45
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 21 Feb 93 Volume 93 : Issue 45

Today's Topics:

 Closed repeaters
 Eliminate the Written Exam (2 msgs)
 Exam of No Code Tech
 Vero Beach stop transmitting order by judge

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 20 Feb 1993 19:34:26 -0500
From: usc!hela.iti.org!cs.widener.edu!widener!nobody@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Closed repeaters
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <12192103d@ofa123.fidonet.org> Larry.Mc.Donald@ofa123.fidonet.org
writes:

>
> jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu
> (Jay Maynard) sez:
> > In article <mnzs9!l@dixie.com> jgd@dixie.com (John De Armond) writes:
> >>Well, you can rant and rave and wave your arms all you like but the fact
> >>remains, if the cactus boys charge an admission fee to their closed
> >>little world, they are as illegal as hell.
> >
> > If you're so all-fired sure about this, then FILE A COMPLAINT!!!
>
> Hey! An excellent idea! Maybe we can get all these posts
>about closed/private repeaters off of the net and in the FCC's

>mailbox where it belongs. I'm sure if all of us who have not
>been "invited" to use the private bands wrote to the FCC,
>something would happen. I've written to and been ignored by the
>ARRL, so the only other folks to write to are the FCC. 'Corse
>the amateurs might lost these 'private' bands, but since I've not
>been "invited" to operate there, what do I care? At least the
>FCC, who claim to be short on cash, should rent these freqs to
>the folks who insist we pay rent to them.
> Posting here on the Usenet on this subject sure doesn't seem
>to be a very productive use of rhetoric.

I am new to this newsgroup, and haven't caught all the previous "very
productive use of rhetoric". Can someone bring me up to date on who the
Cactus boys are? Are these folks like the oak ridge boys of ham? What
gives?

stuart b. tener, n3gwg
Philadelphia, PA
tener@cs.widener.edu
(215)-338-6005

Date: Fri, 19 Feb 1993 20:33:43 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hp1extra!hp1-opus!hpnmdla!alanb@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, pettitda@NeXtwork.Rose-Hulman.Edu (David A Pettit)
writes:

>In article <14600044@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com> alanb@hpnmdla.sr.hp.com (Alan
>Bloom) writes:

>> ... Young kids typically don't have much trouble with the code exam,
>> but the written exam can be a real barrier. ...

>... And for the written exam being a barrier, ONLY if you are
>talking about a 3rd grader is going to be true. Young kids are more
>likely to be able to memorize things that they want to learn than older
>folks, and that's all the written test amounts to - memorization.

The kids definitely have more of a problem with the written exam than the
code. A good example is a father/son team I know. The father is an
electrical engineer -- he passed the Tech written easily, and I'm sure
could pass the other written exams with no problem, but he failed the
code. The son passed the code test easily, but failed the Tech written.
Now the son is a Novice and the father a no-code Tech. They can't

talk to each other on the air!

AL N1AL

Date: Sat, 20 Feb 93 01:41:42 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!n1mpq!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Eliminate the Written Exam
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ean@gvls2.gvl.unisys.com (Ed Naratil) writes:

```
> In article <weltyrc.930217031537@wilbur.eng.auburn.edu> weltyrc@eng.auburn.ed
> >73 de Ryan KD4VZX
> >
>
> Is that a "yea" or a "nay"?
>
> --
```

I hope it was a "nay" as mine would be the same. If I had to go through the theory tests then someone else should have to or else the ham bands are gonna end up the same as the 11m band, total trash. BTW, I think the party left something out. Some of those regulations are there to protect the operator from dangerous RF energy, etc.

I always knew some idiot would come up with the "No Code, No Theory license". Grrrrrrr.....

Tony

```
-----
-- Tony Pelliccio, N1MPQ/AA           // Why do some hams run 20mW      //
-- god @ garlic.sbs.com               // into a stub-duddy in a car    //
-----// and wonder why they can't  //
-- And for those wondering:           // hit a repeater?              //
-- Yes I AM flame retardent!          -----
-- #include ASBESTOS_UNDERWEAR ON -- Soon a 2x2 call                    --
-----
```

Date: Fri, 19 Feb 1993 20:26:23 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpl-opus!hpnmdla!alanb@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Exam of No Code Tech

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, willis@cs.tamu.edu (Willis Marti) writes:

>What most people seem to have missed (and it helps to have read Al's
>posts before) is that the whole point of his "suggestion" is contained
>at the end:

>>"By the way, all these arguments hold equally well for the code exam.
>>If you believe the code exam should be eliminated, then the same
>>arguments hold for the written exam as well.

>>AL N1AL"

Yeah, I knew when I write it I was probably being too subtle.

>And this last part is false. The written tests serve to validate your
>knowledge of operating practices, regulations and equipment that you
>*must* use. CW tests validate your knowledge of a mode you *may* use.

I can't think of a single operating practice or equipment that you
must use. And that's true for nearly all the regulations as well.
Why should I have to know the frequencies of the UHF bands if all I
plan to do is operate 2 meters? Why should I have to learn about
ID requirements for RTTY/digital transmissions if I will never use
those modes?

The answer is that amateurs are supposed to have at least some basic
knowledge about all facets of the hobby. All hams should know at least
a little about ATV, packet, VHF propagation and, yes, even CW. One
reason is that you MIGHT use one of those modes someday, so you need
to know how to do it right. Another reason is that if you do know
something about it, you are MORE LIKELY to try it sometime in
the future. Diversity is good -- it should be encouraged.

However, the dark side of diversity is that each group comes to think
that their activity is the most important in all of amateur radio.
I remember years ago a visitor to W1AW telling me in all earnestness
that it should be obvious to any rational observer that ATV
(Amateur Television) was the future of amateur radio, and it was
just unfathomable why QST didn't run at least one or two ATV
articles in each issue. Some people on the Internet feel the
same way about packet (or computers, or DSP or ...)

About 4 or 5 years ago, I presented a proposal to the local ham club
to purchase some equipment to set up a packet digipeater. A vocal
minority of the members thought that this "packet racket" was a
bunch of nonsense and we shouldn't waste our money on it. Now

several of them are active on the mode.

Hey gang, we're all in this hobby together. If somebody else is gung-ho into some area you consider irrelevant (be it packet, DXing, or CW), don't criticize. You may get interested in it yourself someday.

AL N1AL

Date: Fri, 19 Feb 93 21:45:30 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!ncr-sd!ncrcae!ncrh2!torynews!kevin@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Vero Beach stop transmitting order by judge
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Feb17.154656.9521@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>
>Now just to point out the worst case possibility here and
>elsewhere, just think of all the folks who are now being
>scared silly because of the media focus on RF (cellphone
>usage, living near power lines, living near transmitter sites,
>etc.) and electromagnetic fields as possible cancer causes.
>If you don't think there's at least several thousands of
>extremists out there that would outlaw ham radio transmission
>immediately just because they think it might be a health threat,
>then you sadly underestimate the possibilities.
>

I am curious as to what effect PRB-1 would have on this case. I was under the impression that PRB-1 basically forbids county or municipality zoning restrictions, and specifically gives the amateur the *right* to practice his avocation using whatever antennas are necessary. How can a court make a ruling in conflict with PRB-1? Under what law was this ruling made?

If this were a lawsuit over broken CC&R's, then I would understand and not worry about it; I've decided already that I will not buy a home in an area which requires CC&R's, not only because of ham radio, but just because I think it's none of my neighbor's d*mn business what I do in my own home.

--
Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ NCR Torrey Pines
kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com (619) 597-3602
kevin%beacons@cyber.net

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #45
